## United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge Milto		on I. Shadur	Sitting Judge if Othe than Assigned Judg	r e					
CASE NUMBER 00		C 8155	DATE		½/2001				
CASE TITLE			Dukhan Iqraa Jihad Mumin vs. Attorney General						
М	OTION:	[In the following bo of the motion being	x (a) indicate the party filing presented.]	the motion, e.g., plaintiff, de	efendant, 3rd party plaintif	f, and (b) state briefly the natu			
DO	OCKET ENTRY:								
(1)	☐ Filed	motion of [ use list	ting in "Motion" box at	pove.1					
(2)		Brief in support of motion due							
(3)		Answer brief to motion due Reply to answer brief due							
(4)	□ Rulin	Ruling/Hearing on set for at							
(5)		Status hearing[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at							
(6)	□ Pretri	Pretrial conference[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at							
(7)	☐ Trial[	Trial[set for/re-set for] on at							
(8)				at					
(9)	☐ This c	[Bench/Jury trial] [Hearing] held/continued toat  This case is dismissed [with/without] prejudice and without costs[by/agreement/pursuant to]  □ FRCP4(m) □ General Rule 21 □ FRCP41(a)(1) □ FRCP41(a)(2).							
(10)	Mumin unde or other plead February 16,	r the provisions ding in response 2001. This acti	nter Memorandum (nuary 20, 2001. This of the Criminal Just to the Petition in acon is set for a status	ice Act. This Courted act. This Courted act. This Courted act. This Courted act. Secondance with Secondance at 9 a.m.	e Federal Defende rt orders responde	r Panel to represent nt to file an answer			
(11)		rther detail see ord	er attached to the origin	al minute order.]					
	No notices required, ac	No notices required, advised in open court.				Document			
1	Notices mailed by judge's staff.				number of notices	Number			
	Notified counsel by telephone.				JAN 03 200				
	Docketing to mail notices.				date dockéted				
	Mail AO 450 form.				docketing dephty initials				
Copy to judge/magistrate judge.		1		1/2/2001					
	SN	courtroom deputy's	6 - Combre 111 3: 51		date mailed notice				
		initials	Date/time re	ceived in	SN				
			central Clerl		mailing deputy initials				

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

DUKHAN I	QRAA JIHAD MUMIN, #51778	)				
	Petitioner,	)				
v.		)	No.	00 C	8155	
[Unnamed	custodian and]	)				
	GENERAL OF THE STATE OF JIM RYAN,	)				MINTE
	Respondents.	)				Carried &

## MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Dukhan Iqraa Jihad Mumin ("Mumin") has submitted a selfprepared and prepaid Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus .

("Petition") under 28 U.S.C. §2254 ("Section 2254"), challenging
his conviction and sentence following his guilty plea to a single
count of forgery (pursuant to a plea agreement, four other counts
against Mumin were dismissed at the time of sentencing). This
memorandum opinion and order will address several matters raised
by the Petition.

To begin with, Mumin has not complied with the requirement of Rule 2(b) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts ("Section 2254 Rules") in situations where, as here, an applicant for habeas relief is not now in custody pursuant to the state judgment against which he seeks relief but may be subject to such custody in the future. In this instance Mumin is now serving a 10 to 15 year sentence in the Nebraska State Penitentiary (a sentence that began on

2

JAN 03 2001

March 29, 1998 and on which he is scheduled for parole in early 2004--see Petition at 8. While he was serving that sentence, Mumin was taken to Illinois under the Interstate Agreement on Detainers Act to address the forgery and other charges in DuPage County (id.), and he then entered his guilty plea and was sentenced here in Illinois.

Under those circumstances, Section 2254 Rule 2(b) requires

Mumin to name two respondents in his Petition--the officer who

now has custody over him (the Warden of the Nebraska prison where
he is serving time) and Illinois Attorney General Jim Ryan.

Because Mumin has named the latter but not the former respondent,
he is ordered to file a brief amendment to his Petition curing

that oversight on or before January 20, 2001.

Another matter that relates to Mumin's dual conviction situation, but is left unanswered by the Petition, is whether and to what extent Mumin's Illinois sentence that he seeks to challenge here was imposed concurrently with or consecutively to the preexisting Nebraska sentence. If concurrent sentences are involved, one question that would perhaps have to be addressed is whether the availability or unavailability of habeas relief from the Illinois sentence would make any difference to Mumin at all. This Court of course expresses no view on that subject, but Mumin should also include that information as part of the amendment to his Petition that has been ordered in the preceding paragraph.

Subject to anything that might develop in that respect, it does appear from the Petition that Mumin has exhausted his available state court remedies as required by Section 2254(b)(1)(A)(see Petition at 2-4), that the Petition is timely filed in accordance with Section 2244(d)(1), and that the substantive allegations in the Petition set out one or more claims that are substantively colorable. Accordingly:

- 1. This Court appoints the Federal Defender Panel to represent Mumin under the provisions of the Criminal Justice Act (18 U.S.C. §3006A(a)(2)(B)).
- 2. This Court orders respondent Illinois Attorney General Jim Ryan to file an answer or other pleading in response to the Petition in accordance with Section 2254 Rules 4 and 5 on or before February 16, 2001.
- 3. This action is set for an initial status hearing at 9 a.m. February 23, 2001.

Milton T Shadur

Senior United States District Judge

Date: January 2, 2001

Naming of the member of that Panel who will be given responsibility for the representation will take place shortly hereafter.